DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 346 214 UD 028 704

AUTHOR Lewis, James H.
TITLE Learning from the Past--Preparing for the Future: Addressing Fair and Affordable Housing Issues in the Chicago Region.
PUB DATE 2 Nov 91
NOTE 16p.; Paper presented at the Conference of the Chicago Urban League (Chicago, IL, November 2, 1991).
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Affirmative Action; *Black Population Trends; Civil Rights; *Economic Development; Elementary Secondary Education; *Ethnic Distribution; *Hispanic Americans; *Housing; Racial Differences; Racial Discrimination; *Racial Segregation; Social Problems; Sociocultural Patterns; Suburbs; Urban Areas; Whites
IDENTIFIERS *Illinois (Chicago)

ABSTRACT

This conference paper discusses the current situation of racial differences in housing in the Chicago (Illinois) area with regard to the ramifications of the "Miliken v. Bradley" (1974) case. The Miliken case closed the door on busing and school desegregation plans crossing school district lines and in many cases, crossing municipal boundaries. It legitimized the idea that social problems could be geographically limited and that accountability for social welfare should be localized. The case's impact is far-reaching in terms of the way people think about the relationship between the predominantly Black and Hispanic American inner city and the predominantly White suburbs and who is responsible for what problems. The maintenance of separations directly affects housing and the economy within metropolitan systems. The following major topics are discussed: (1) metropolitan patterns of segregation (high segregation in Chicago with very few Blacks and Hispanic Americans living among Whites, and increased suburban populations of Blacks and Hispanic Americans, but high concentrations of each in relatively few communities); (2) community types (older enclaves, high proportion Black, rapid growth, moderate growth, and losing); (3) segregation and employment; and (4) a metropolitan approach (continued commitment to the education system, efficient public transportation and improved access of Chicago's unemployed to areas of suburban economic growth, regional commitment to economic revival of the southeast side of Chicago, and acknowledgment of the interconnectedness of the metropolitan system and recognition that unemployment and poverty in Chicago mean welfare and prison costs elsewhere). (SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED346214

CONFERENCE PRESENTATION BY JAMES H. LEWIS, Ph.D.
Director of Research and Planning
Chicago Urban League

Learning From the Past - Preparing for the Future
Addressing Fair and Affordable Housing Issues in the Chicago Region

November 2, 1991
Hillside Village Hall

Sponsored by:

Chicago Area Fair Housing Alliance
Cook County Department of Planning & Development
DuPage Mayors and Managers Conference
Home Builders Association of Greater Chicago
Illinois Department of Human Rights
Illinois Housing Development Authority
Leadership Council for Metropolitan Open Communities
Northeastern Illinois Planning Commission
Northwest Municipal Conference
South Suburban Mayors and Managers Association
West Central Municipal Conference

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
R. Fox
Chicago Urban League
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

VO028 704

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Miliken v. Bradley, 1974. Chief Justice Warren Burger writing for the majority explained:

"The notion that school district lines may be casually ignored or treated as a mere administrative convenience" is "contrary to the history of public education in our country ... No single tradition in public education is more deeply rooted than local control over the operation of schools; local autonomy has long been thought essential ... Without an inter-district violation and inter-district effect, there is no constitutional wrong calling for an inter-district remedy."

With those words, the Court closed the door on busing and school desegregation plans crossing school district lines, and in many cases, crossing municipal boundaries. However, I think the impact was even more far-reaching in terms of the way people think about the relationship between the city and the suburbs and who is responsible for what problems. Miliken legitimized the idea that social problems could be geographically limited and that accountability for social welfare should be localized. The Court might have ruled in a different sort of way as it has with respect to Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act and one person-one vote, by saying in effect that where district lines don't create anything constructive, they could not stand in the way of realizing an important social good, equality of educational opportunity.

I grew up in this period of busing. In the isolated south side of Kansas City where the Center school district is distinct from the remainder of the Kansas City schools in the Kansas City School District, there was a collective sigh of relief at Miliken. There would

continue to be busing within the Kansas City school district, but Kansas City's racial problems would not infect us in the Center school district and of course Kansas City's virtually all white suburbs would remain immune to racial conflict, and additionally, to inter-racial experience and reconciliation. It was no doubt the same in many Chicago suburbs as well.

Miliken did not, of course, make the inner city predominently black and Hispanic and the suburbs predominently white. However, coming at the end of an era that included the 1954 Brown decision which began school desegregation, the 1964 Civil Rights Act, which significantly altered racial considerations in hiring, and the 1965 Voting Rights Act, which now defines largely who we share our legislative districts with, Miliken clearly made a statement that people in the suburbs could be safe from some things, at least, and remains a powerful symbol of the limitation on metropolitan solutions to problems. That is a theme I will return to in a moment, because I think the strongest social systems are those that most successfully join, rather than separate, their disparate members. We know a great deal about maintaining separations and this tendency directly bears on housing and the economy as viewed locally within our metropolitan system.

Metropolitan Patterns of Segregation

Twenty years after Miliken we observe only subtle differences in racial housing patterns from what we would have observed then.

The 1990 census returns presented a mixed picture with respect to the integration of different populations within the Chicago area. A couple of broad findings are readily

observed:

1. The city of Chicago remains highly segregated with very few blacks and Hispanics living among whites. There has been virtually no improvement in integration during the 1980s.
2. Both black and Hispanic populations in the suburbs increased considerably during the 1980s but a high level of segregation remains. Blacks, in particular, who have moved to the suburbs, remain concentrated in relatively few communities. Most suburban blacks live in just 43 of the 270 suburban municipalities.

Much of the discussion of segregation that will follow will rely on a statistical measure called the dissimilarity index. The dissimilarity index measures the extent to which various racial groups are evenly spread across a geographic area. For example, if a town was 20% black, then perfect similarity, or integration, would be achieved if every block were 20% black. This would produce a dissimilarity score of 0. On the other hand, total segregation would occur if all of the blacks were concentrated on only a few blocks, creating a dissimilarity score of 100, or perfect segregation. The Urban League has calculated these scores for each municipality in the six county area as well as the 77 Chicago community areas.

For the entire metro-Chicago area, this segregation score for black-white integration dropped considerably from 91 in 1980 to 71 in 1990, still highly segregated to be sure. However, the apprarent decrease in segregation masks large amounts of segregation within smaller municipal units. In Chicago, for instance, the segregation score dropped only three percentage points during the 1980s, from 93.1 to 90. This indicates the persistance of almost

total residential segregation in the city.

Racial segregation within counties also remains evident. Cook County as a whole, and McHenry county are almost as segregated as Chicago. DuPage is the most integrated of the six county area but still has a dangerously high score of 64.

Fewer than 10 of Chicago's 77 community areas have disparity scores sufficiently low that they could be considered integrated with respect to blacks and whites. These few communities are found on the north lakefront and Hyde Park. 30 of the 77 Chicago community areas have scores of 80, indicative of extreme segregation. Patterns of black to Hispanic segregation are similar and overall are little different than black-white.

Although the suburbs have many of the same problems of segregation as Chicago, many are characterized by rapid change from white to minority populations, something which in Chicago happened in very few neighborhoods during the 80s.

Several broad observations can be made about the suburbs:

First, the notion that wealthier white communities are more likely to be integrated than middle or lower class white communities receives no support from the 1990 data. The dissimilarity index does not correlate with the wealth of the community. Among the least segregated municipalities with respect to white-black residences are working class suburbs such as Bellwood, Dolton, and Calumet Park. Among the most highly segregated are Lincolnwood, Barrington Hills, Lemont, and Park Ridge. On the other hand, many working class suburbs such as Franklin Park, Stickney, and Berwyn have very high segregation. The initial conclusion to be drawn from this data is that income level <u>per se</u> does not correspond to any particular racial housing pattern.

Second, generally, in towns where blacks do not live in proximity to whites, they also do not live in proximity to Hispanics. In other words, in municipalities with high levels of segregation, blacks tend to live in enclaves segregated from other ethnic groups. Hispanics, on the other hand, tend to live in a state of marginal integration in almost all suburbs in which they reside. Of 261 total municipalities, 154 (60%) have white-Hispanic segregation scores over 50 while 233 (88%) suburbs have white-black scores over 50. Hispanics are much more likely to live among whites than are blacks.

The overall trend shows that Hispanics actually became more segregated over the 1980s. In other words, Hispanic communities are becoming more densely Hispanic. This has been good news for those supporting the creation of a Hispanic congressional district and increased numbers of state legislative and Chicago city council seats. In the past, Hispanics had been too widely dispersed within Chicago for there to be any possibility of drawing a congressional district map that could encompass them. That has now become something that should be done.

In measuring real change in the composition and shape of the Hispanic community, we must be careful to account for the demongraphic/statistical effects of the Immigration Reform and Control Act. Increased documentation of Hispanic immigrants after 1986 may well have resulted in the Census Bureau counting for the first time in 1990 individuals who actually lived in Chicago in 1980 but intentionally evaded counting. The actual Hispanic population in 1980 was, of course, considerably larger than the Bureau reported at that time and the 1990 statistical gains over the 1980s, and the apparent increased concentration of Hispanic populations, may be somewhat attributable to statistical artifact.

Focusing in on black communities in the Chicago metro area, the 1990 census tells us that, 42 municipalities are at least 10% black. This is an increase of 17 from 1980. The decrease in segregation at the metropolitan level is largely attributable to this significant influx of African Americans into the near south and west suburbs.

Among these 42 suburbs, a strong relationship maintained between the segregation score and the rate of population increase. Suburbs that had rapidly increasing black populations tended to have less segregation. Communities with relatively stable black populations, large or small, tended to be more highly segregated.

Stably integrated neighborhoods are as rare in the suburbs as in Chicago. In 1980 in Chicago, for instance, Gary Orfield identified only 61 census tracts out of the approximately 2,000 that could be called stably integrated. For many communities, the concern must be raised that the process of increasing black population is only a step along the road to a re-segregated community. It is very likely that the apparently newly integrated communities of 1990 will be newly segregated in the year 2000.

Community Types

To get a clearer understanding of this broad pattern of racial change, it is useful to divide the suburbs with significant black communities into five basic types. Population changes in the suburbs is not uniform and the minority communities in various suburbs can be very different. The five types are:

1) Older Enclaves

2) High Proportion Black

3) Rapid Growth

4) Moderate Growth

5) Losing

1. The Older Enclaves are the four towns of Evanston, Joliet, Waukegan, and Aurora. All are from 10% to 20% black. All have had black communities for many years. It is interesting to note that Evanston in particular markets itself as a "diverse" community, based on its combination of many high income people with a substantial minority community. However, it is also one of the most segregated towns in the area, with a segregation score of 69. Minority populations in the enclave suburbs grew little during the 1980s and their people remained highly segregated.

2. The High Proportion Black suburbs include the 9 towns that are at least 70% black. The black suburbs come in two types. Ford Heights, Robbins, Phoenix, Markham, Maywood, and Harvey all are characterized by large numbers of low income people, they maintained their population size during the 1980s, and the few whites who live there are highly segregated. This is in contrast to University Park, Belwood, and Calumet Park which arrived in 1990 as almost all black due to high growth during the 1980s, effectively completing a re-segregation pattern. These three suburbs also have larger numbers of high income residents and those whites who remain are highly integrated.

3) Seven towns experienced extremely Rapid Growth of black populations. Black populations in these towns grew an average of 30% during the 1980s leaving them 40% to 50% black. These municipalities included Broadview, East Hazel Crest, Matteson, Dolton, Hazel Crest, Riverdale, and Country Club Hills. These towns had higher per capita incomes

than the all black suburbs. The rapid growth rates left most of them moderately segregated and make them excellent candidates for re-segregation during the next two decades. These towns are inhabited by the a strengthened black middle class which, as sociologist William Wilson has observed, is migrating out of Chicago.

4) Nineteen towns fell into the category Moderate Growth. These suburbs experienced average black growth rates of 11%. For towns experiencing this gradual growth, the more blacks and low income residents there were, the higher the rate of segregation. 5) The final category is the three Losing municipalities, Chicago, Dixmoor, and Summit. They have in common that, in only these three towns of the 42, did the black percentage of the town's population fall during the 1980s. They are all characterized by substantial low income populations and very high levels of segregation.

Among the 29 municipalities that are at least 10% black and are experiencing black growth, higher growth rates tend to correspond to higher per capita income in 1980 and lower levels of segregation. It is important to note, however, that the communities experiencing these significant growth rates tend to have lower housing values than the hundreds of area municipalities which remain almost entirely white. That black growth was fastest in communities with moderate rather than lowest cost housing tends to support the thesis of a gradual residential separation of lower from higher income blacks. The 1990 census patterns clearly show, however, that blacks have succeeded in penetrating many white middle class suburbs in proximity to Chicago but remain almost entirely shut out of upper income white communities. The overall pattern outlined here is consistent with a trend toward re-segregation of south Cook communities. We see almost no communities with

truly low segregation scores.

A number of explanations can be identified for this pattern of suburban housing segregation. Recent data published in the Chicago Tribune suggests that at best minorities have less access to mortgages and at worst discriminatory practices may remain within the lending industry. Secondly, the work of the Leadership Council, in particular, has indicated that racial steering on the part of real estate agents continues, although clearly not in so pronounced a way as in the past.

Discrimination in lending and real estate are direct products of racial fear, and it is interesting to note at this point that recent survey data from MCIC suggests that blacks who live in the suburbs are actually less satisfied with neighborhood quality than are whites. Suburban black neighborhoods are characterized by higher levels of crime than white neighborhoods and black suburbanites respond in exactly the same ways as do whites.

Fifty-nine percent of blacks, but only 41% of whites said that what they particularly liked about their neighborhood was that it was clean and quiet. But, whereas 70% of whites were "very satisfied" with their neighborhoods, only 46% of blacks could make the same claim. Blacks were far more likely to mention high crime, lack of safety, and gang activity as reasons they disliked their neighborhoods than did whites. Whites tended to be unhappy with taxes and street congestion. Clearly the goals of white and black suburbanites are quite similar, but many of the social problems pervading Chicago's segregated inner city also pervade the predominently black suburbs.

The biggest reasons for the segregated housing patterns have to do with individual choices made by members of minority groups and the continued close association of race

with occupation and income. Both because of the strong group associations founded in the American history of racism, racial bonding born out of discomfort with whites, and because of mutual cultural identification, many blacks and Hispanics simply choose to live with one another. We should not, however, stop asking why this need continue to be the case.

The second major reason, the segregated work place, leads us into the second portion of my remarks.

Segregation and Employment

Both in Chicago and in the suburbs, we can observe a dramatic segregation of the work force on the basis of race. Chicago Urban League research finds that in suburban Cook, DuPage, and McHenry counties, blacks are highly under-represented in those occupations requiring the most education and paying the most, and over-represented in those requiring the least education and paying least.

Blacks are under-represented by 60% among executives and administrators, by 50% among sales people, and are under-represented by 25% among professionals and precision crafts. Areas that blacks are over-represented in include transportation and moving by 160%, machine operation by 100%, and personal service occupations by 125%, and 20% among handler/laborers. Put into terms of industries, blacks are most over-represented in all levels of government employment, where affirmative-action is most prevalent, and most under-represented in the financial, insurance, wholesale, manufacturing, and construction sectors, where the biggest paychecks are made. Suburban blacks average 18% unemployment while suburban whites average 3.4%.

The boom in professional and commercial employment opportunities for whites, which have made the metropolitan suburbs as prosperous as they are, has been a product of strong regional economic growth during the 1980s. Analysis of equalized assessed property valuations over the last decade shows strong growth in the commercial and industrial sectors in all of the six counties. Yet, this growth has been uneven. DuPage County has been most prosperous, showing commercial EAV growth of 136% and industrial growth of 83%. Chicago, on the other hand, had only modest industrial and commercial growth, primarily associated with continued downtown development. This growth was associated with booming employment in the technical service area. Manufacturing output expanded prodigiously, but employment did not, reflecting tremendous growth in output per worker and the increasing sophistication of the modern workplace.

While encouraging in terms of gross economic growth, these trends are disturbing with respect to the least advantaged people in our region. Growth in technical services and manufacturing productivity reflect the need for highly skilled workers in both areas. Should these trends continued, minorities who have less access to quality education will be increasingly left out of economic growth, which will bode quite badly for those suburbs consisting of largely blue collar minority workers.

Because education funding remains so closely tied to property valuations based on the strength of industrial and commercial sectors, this geographically uneven economic growth clearly produces differential impact on school budgets and educational opportunity. Suburbs with industrial growth or well-paid professional residents will continue to have the best schools and produce the best trained future workers. Suburbs in south and west Cook

County, primarily inhabited by blacks and Hispanics, will continue to have schools less well-supported, and unemployed workers will be in no position to support tax levies for schools. Blacks and Hispanics will continue to cluster in areas that have affordable housing, continuing the pattern of housing segregation.

The patterns of housing and economic segregation clearly have an impact on the health of the regional economy.

First, people living in the inner city cannot get to jobs. Travel times on the public transportation system are virtually prohibitive of the urban poor traveling widely into the suburbs in pursuit of jobs.

Second, suburban industries lack access to the labor that might be expected to perform tasks that require minimal education or training, the jobs that used to represent traditional entry-level employment. The lack of access to this labor has contributed to the decisions of many firms to relocate in places where wage scales are lower, including overseas.

The overall impact of these two major outcomes is that low educated minority people remain highly concentrated in Chicago's ghetto with seemingly little hope for improvement.

A Metropolitan Approach

The answers to many of these problems lie in adopting a metropolitan perspective to residence, economics, and education. In his provocative new book, Robert Reich notes that America's more successful competitors approach economic development and other national priorities with a greater singleness of purpose. For instance, when one attempts foreign trade with Japan, you deal with one trade office. However, when a foreign firm considers

locating in the United States, it has the opportunity to deal with a plethora of states and municipalities, each willing to bid against all the others to offer the firm tax incentives to locate there. In effect, Americans continually bid against themselves, acting out of local rather than corporate interest.

Most people appear to see the racial problems that are entwined with residential and economic segregation to be solvable. MCIC survey research finds that 56% of whites believe the biggest reason for black/white differences is opportunity for education. 38% believe differences are attributable to discrimination, while 38% believe black/white differences are attributable to blacks having less motivation to succeed.

Clearly the tools exist in our legal framework to erradicate discrimination in most areas of American life provided we have the will to do so. Despite recent rhetoric about quotas and the Civil Rights legislation, survey data shows that a majority of metropolitan Chicago whites actually support affirmative action programs.

Education and motivation also have interesting aspects. For instance, 42% of suburban whites feel that taxes are about right or even too low and another 25% feel that they are only a little too high. The prognosis would seem, therefore, to be favorable for improving the distribution of taxes levied for education. As long as uneven economic growth provides such disparate ranges of property value per student, it is imperative that some means be found for sharing property tax revenues, or in some way sharing monies between have and have-not school districts.

Finally, even though 38% of suburban whites see motivation to succeed as a reason for black and white differences, only 8% see this as a problem inherent to race. This suggests

that most people see individual attitudes as socially or environmentally determined. This suggests the possibility of public support for policies that would reduce disparities between blacks and whites.

Given rigorous enforcement of anti-discrimination laws, access to housing becomes largely a question of economic opportunity. In closing, let me suggest four areas where we might look for public policy that will substantially improve that economic environment:

First, there must be continued commitment to the educational system such that rigorous standards are enforced both for teachers and students, and financial resources are shared between districts populated by both rich and poor people;

Second, as long as racial and income groups remain largely segregated, there must be efficient public transportation and improved access of Chicago's unemployed to areas of suburban economic growth;

Third, a regional commitment should be made to economic revival of the southeast side of Chicago; and

Finally, we must acknowledge the interconnectedness of our metropolitan system: that unemployment and poverty in Chicago mean welfare and prison costs everywhere. That all forms of racial isolation bear a heavy price when they make America less than one nation.

Thank you.